Dallas

Glenn A. Tobleman, F.S.A., F.C.A.S. S. Scott Gibson, F.S.A. Cabe W. Chadick, F.S.A. Michael A. Mayberry, F.S.A. David M. Dillon, F.S.A. Gregory S. Wilson, F.C.A.S. Steven D. Bryson, F.S.A. Bonnie S. Albritton, F.S.A. Brian D. Rankin, F.S.A. Wesley R. Campbell, F.C.A.S., F.S.A. Jacqueline B. Lee, F.S.A. Brian C. Stentz, A.S.A. Robert E. Gove, A.S.A. J. Finn Knox-Seith, A.S.A Jennifer M. Allen, A.S.A. Josh A. Hammerquist, A.S.A. Xiaoxiao (Lisa) Jiang, A.S.A. Sujaritha Tansen, A.S.A Jay W. Fuller, A.S.A. Sergei Mordovin, A.S.A Robert B. Thomas, Jr., F.S.A., C.F.A. (Of Counsel)



Kansas City

Gary L. Rose, F.S.A.
Terry M. Long, F.S.A.
Leon L. Langlitz, F.S.A.
Anthony G. Proulx, F.S.A.
Thomas L. Handley, F.S.A.
D. Patrick Glenn, A.S.A., A.C.A.S.
Christopher H. Davis, F.S.A.
Karen E. Elsom, F.S.A.
Jill J. Humes, F.S.A.
Christopher J. Merkel, F.S.A.
Kimberly S. Shores, F.S.A.
Jan E. DeClue, A.S.A.
Patricia A. Peebles, A.S.A.

London / Kansas City

Roger K. Annin, F.S.A. Timothy A. DeMars, F.S.A. Scott E. Morrow, F.S.A.

Baltimore

David A. Palmer, C.F.E.

March 14, 2014

Green Mountain Care Board State of Vermont 89 Main Street, Third Floor, City Center Montpelier, VT 05620

Re: The Vermont Health Plan – 2014 TVHP Provision for Large Claims Filing (SERFF # BCVT-129374083)

The purpose of this letter is to provide a summary and recommendation regarding the proposed 2014 The Vermont Health Plan (TVHP) Provision for Large Claims Filing and to assist the Board in assessing whether to approve, modify, or disapprove the request.

Filing Description

- 1. TVHP is a licensed health maintenance organization (HMO) and for-profit subsidiary of Blue Cross Shield of Vermont (BCBSVT). TVHP provides large group coverage to employers in Vermont.
- 2. The present filing is a factor filing that modifies the large claim factors and cost of reinsurance for Merit groups. These factors are used to estimate the impact of large health claims when determining rates from a company's experience. The requested factor changes represent a subset of the overall rate charged for Merit groups. The other subsets are addressed in other filings.
- 3. In this filing, there are approximately 10,600 Vermonters affected.
- 4. The overall rate impact of this filing broken out by factor change is:
 - Merit Groups
 - o Large Claim Factors: 2.0% (\$8.31 PMPM).
 - o Cost of Reinsurance: \$2.31 PMPM (increased from \$2.38 PMPM to \$4.68 PMPM)

Standard of Review

Pursuant to Green Mountain Care Board Rule 2.000 Health Insurance Rate Review, this letter is to assist the Board in determining whether the requested rate is affordable, promotes quality care, promotes access to health care, protects insurer solvency, and is not unjust,

Green Mountain Care Board March 14, 2014 Page 2 of 7

unfair, inequitable, misleading, or contrary to the law, and is not excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory.

Summary of the Data Received

TVHP provided the methodology used to create the data set of historical experience to be used to develop the proposed factors. TVHP used 2013 Milliman Health Cost Guidelines to create a set of factors that would be blended with company claim experience when that experience was not statistically credible. An exhibit was provided showing the actual factors and expected factors from the prior filings. TVHP also provided the methodology for determining the net cost of reinsurance PMPM.

Company's Analysis

1. Large Claim Factors. The large claim factors are used to estimate the impact of large health claims when determining rates from a company's experience. Large claims can vary significantly from year to year. To reduce this volatility, issuers typically remove claims over a certain amount ("attachment point") from a group's experience to exclude outliers that would affect a group's future rates. An expected average large claim amount is added back to the group's claims that are lower than the attachment point to determine the total claims for a group. The expected amount of large claims is developed from the past experience of all BCBSVT/TVHP Merit and BCBSVT Cost Plus groups. The expected amount of large claims is presented as a percent of overall claims.

TVHP utilized the BCBSVT/TVHP allowed claims experience paid through September 2013 for calendar years 2011 and 2012. Since the analysis is performed at the aggregate allowed level, the different products will not affect the underlying data set and analysis.

In prior filings, all managed mental health claims were excluded from the data set because the coverage was capitated and provided via an external vendor. Because managed mental health coverage is now provided by TVHP, all experience for mental health coverage was included in this analysis.

The experience data set was trended forward using 4.1%. Calendar year 2012 data was given twice the weight of 2011 to give more emphasis to recent experience and add statistical credibility.

Typically, a company's large claim experience is not statistically credible for projection purposes. Supplemental data is needed when the data set is not statistically credible enough. TVHP supplemented with 2013 Milliman Health Cost Guidelines. The Milliman factors were blended with the Company's experience factors using a credibility factor. The credibility formula assigns a factor of 100% for an attachment point of \$30,000 down to 1% for an attachment point of \$195,000. The attachment point limits were established in a Q1 2008 filing.

TVHP provided Actual to Expected exhibit Calendar Year 2012 for various attachment points.

2. *Cost of Reinsurance*. TVHP purchased reinsurance for claims in excess of \$250,000 for 2014. The Company estimated the PMPM using a 75% loss ratio.

Green Mountain Care Board March 14, 2014 Page 3 of 7

L&E Analysis

1. *Large Claim Factors*: When developing large claim factors, creating a reliable and statistically credible data set can be challenging. TVHP has combined data from both BCBSVT/TVHP Merit groups and BCBSVT Cost Plus groups. This appears to be reasonable and appropriate in order to create a large and credible data set for setting these factors.

The Company used calendar years 2011 and 2012 with 2012 weighted twice as much as 2011 for the data set. The claims have been run out through September 2013. This methodology for weighting and run out is consistent with the 2013 Provision for Large Claims Filing (SERFF # BCVT-128829841, VFN 63888). The timeframe of the data set is reasonable and appropriate, utilizing full calendar year data with ample time for outstanding claims to be paid.

The addition of the all managed mental health claims in this data set is appropriate since this coverage is now provided by TVHP. The experience data set was trended using 4.1%. The development of the data set appears to be reasonable and appropriate.

Company experience was supplemented with 2013 Milliman Health Cost Guidelines, which is appropriate when the Company's experience is not credible. We requested additional information about the credibility formula and its appropriateness. The current credibility formula assigns a factor of 100% for an attachment point of \$38,000 down to a factor of 1% for an attachment point of \$248,000. These limits have been trended from Q1 2008. The Company provided additional information regarding a study that was performed for the 2008 filing. The 2008 filing indicated that the variability below \$30,000 was small and increased up to \$200,000. The credibility formula and methodology appear to be reasonable and appropriate.

The Actual to Expected (A2E) exhibits show the similarities and differences in the actual to expected ratios. A2E exhibits are useful for determining how a company's expected pricing has compared to the actual amounts. For large claim analysis, A2E exhibits do not account for the credibility of the data set and do not include trend to the rating period.

Since we only received calendar year 2012, we requested a similar exhibit with both calendar years 2011 and 2012 combined. As attachment points increase, the amount of data at these claim levels decreases, which results in the Milliman factors having a greater influence on the factors proposed in this filing. The Milliman data is larger and more credible than TVHP's data. We reviewed the A2E exhibits for overall reasonableness, but we did not use these exhibits exclusively because of the lack of credibility at the average attachment point for these types of groups.

The overall factor changes are:

• Merit: Large claim factors increased on average from 13.4% to 16.1%

Given that the average credibility factor used is 0%, these changes are primarily based on changes in the Milliman factors. TVHP stated that the increase in the Milliman factors, especially at the tail of claims distribution, is likely due to the elimination of lifetime maximums through PPACA. This appears reasonable and appropriate based on common industry practices.

The overall rate impact of these factor changes results in an increase of approximately \$8

Green Mountain Care Board March 14, 2014 Page 4 of 7

PMPM on rates (~2%). The proposed factor changes and methodology in determining these changes appear to be reasonable and appropriate.

2. *Cost of Reinsurance*: We noted an increase in the estimated PMPM for the Cost of Reinsurance for the Merit groups. In the correspondence, TVHP noted that they had changes to the reinsurance coverage. In 2013, TVHP had reinsurance coverage for claims in excess of \$325,000. Beginning in 2014, TVHP changed the contract coverage to claims in excess of \$250,000. Notwithstanding other potential changes, this alone would increase the cost of coverage.

The Company provided an A2E exhibit that showed that the estimates were in line with the actual costs. The increase from \$2.38 PMPM to \$4.68 PMPM appears to be solely due to the change in contract terms. The methodology and estimates of the Cost of Reinsurance appear to be reasonable, appropriate, and in line with estimates in prior filings.

Green Mountain Care Board March 14, 2014 Page 5 of 7

Recommendation

L&E believes that this filing does not produce rates that are excessive, inadequate, or unfairly discriminatory. Therefore, L&E recommends that the Board approve the filing as requested.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline B. Lee, FSA, MAAA

Vice President &Consulting Actuary

Lewis & Ellis, Inc.

Josh Hammerquist, ASA, MAAA

Josh Hammerquest

Assistant Vice President & Consulting Actuary

Lewis & Ellis, Inc.

David M. Dillon, FSA, MAAA Vice President & Principal

Lewis & Ellis, Inc.

Green Mountain Care Board March 14, 2014 Page 6 of 7

ASOP 41 Disclosures

The Actuarial Standards Board (ASB), vested by the U.S.-based actuarial organizations1, promulgates actuarial standards of practice (ASOPs) for use by actuaries when providing professional services in the United States.

Each of these organizations requires its members, through its Code of Professional Conduct2, to observe the ASOPs of the ASB when practicing in the United States. ASOP 41 provides guidance to actuaries with respect to actuarial communications and requires certain disclosures which are contained in the following.

Identification of the Responsible Actuary

The responsible actuaries are:

- Jacqueline B. Lee, FSA, MAAA, Vice President at Lewis & Ellis, Inc. (L&E).
- Joshua A. Hammerquist, ASA, MAAA, Assistant Vice President at Lewis & Ellis, Inc. (L&E).
- David M. Dillon, FSA, MAAA, MS, Vice President & Principal at Lewis & Ellis, Inc. (L&E).

These actuaries are available to provide supplementary information and explanation. The actuaries also acknowledge that they may be acting as an advocate.

Identification of Actuarial Documents

The date of this document is March 14, 2014. The date (a.k.a. "latest information date") through which data or other information has been considered in performing this analysis is February 25, 2014.

Disclosures in Actuarial Reports

- The contents of this report are intended for the use of the Green Mountain Care Board. The authors of this report are aware that it will be distributed to third parties. Any third party with access to this report acknowledges, as a condition of receipt, that they cannot bring suit, claim, or action against L&E, under any theory of law, related in any way to this material.
- Lewis & Ellis Inc. is financially and organizationally independent from the health insurance issuers whose rate filings were reviewed. There is nothing that would impair or seem to impair the objectivity of the work.
- The purpose of this report is to assist the Board in assessing whether to approve, modify, or disapprove the rate filing.
- The responsible actuaries identified above are qualified as specified in the Qualification Standards of the American Academy of Actuaries.
- Lewis & Ellis has reviewed the data provided by the issuers for reasonableness, but we have not audited it. L&E nor the responsible actuaries assume responsibility for these items that may have a material impact on the analysis. To the extent that there are

¹ The American Academy of Actuaries (Academy), the American Society of Pension Professionals and Actuaries, the Casualty Actuarial Society, the Conference of Consulting Actuaries, and the Society of Actuaries.

² These organizations adopted identical *Codes of Professional Conduct* effective January 1, 2001.

Green Mountain Care Board March 14, 2014 Page 7 of 7

material inaccuracies in, misrepresentations in, or lack of adequate disclosure by the data, the results may be accordingly affected.

- We are not aware of any subsequent events that may have a material effect on the findings.
- There are no other documents or files that accompany this report.
- The findings of this report are enclosed herein.

Actuarial Findings

The actuarial findings of the report can be found in the body of this report.

Methods, Procedures, Assumptions, and Data

The methods, procedures, assumptions and data used by the actuary can be found in body of this report.

Assumptions or Methods Prescribed by Law

This report was prepared as prescribed by applicable law, statues, regulations and other legally binding authority.

Responsibility for Assumptions and Methods

The actuaries do not disclaim responsibility for material assumptions or methods.

Deviation from the Guidance of an ASOP

The actuaries have not deviated materially from the guidance set forth in an applicable ASOP.